REMARKS

Applicants' attorney appreciates the reminder concerning the priority notice. Accordingly, the specification has been amended to expressly include a claim for priority of two provisional applications.

The objection to the drawings has been noted. Drawings will be provided upon an indication of allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Marshall, U.S. Patent 4,634,527. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Marshall fails to disclose a filter element comprising an end cap having first AND second sections. Rather, Marshall discloses a filter element having only a single flange 14 sealed at one end of the filtering material 10. Marshall further discloses a wall 16, but the wall is completely independent of the filter element and in no sense forms part of an end cap. Rather, the filter element is adapted to be received by the wall 16 and the wall 16 serves as a holder for the filter element. Accordingly, it is respectfully contended that Marshall fails to anticipate independent claim 4.

Independent claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eckman, U.S. Patent No. 5,470,469 and claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eckman in view of Heybutzki et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,332,410 or Ciliberti et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,735,638.

Eckman is the principal reference for both of these rejections and Eckman fails to disclose or suggest a pleated pack or a pleated porous medium. Eckman discloses in column 1 that fluid separation apparatuses are generally classified as a flat membrane type, tubular type, spiral type and hollow fiber type according to the shape and form of the membrane used therein. Eckman then proceeds to teach away from any type of membrane except hallow fiber membranes. In particular, Eckman immediately dismisses all of the membranes except the hollow fiber type and the spiral type, noting in column 1 that these types are especially

well known for reverse osmosis. Further, in column 2, Eckman asserts the superiority of hollow fiber type membranes over spiral type membranes, noting that hollow fiber fluid separation apparatuses solve most of the problems associated with spiral wound fluid separation apparatuses. Eckman is thus entirely concerned with hollow fiber membranes to the exclusion of all other types.

Time and again Eckman notes that the invention relates only to hollow fiber membranes. "It is desirable to have a hollow fiber membrane cartridge." (col. 3, line 60). "The present invention provides a hollow fiber membrane cartridge." (col. 4, line 5). "The present invention is a simple, efficient, low-cost cartridge which contains a plurality of hollow fiber membranes." (col. 4, line 28). "The term cartridge refers to a device comprising a bundle of hollow fiber membranes." (col. 4, line 34). One of ordinary skill in the art reading Eckman either alone or in combination with any secondary reference, would never be motivated to provide a pleated pack. Accordingly, it is respectfully contended that Eckman, alone or in combination, fails to render claims 1-3 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks it is respectfully contended that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER

John M. Belz
Registration No. 30,359

Suite 300
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 737-6770
Facsimile: (202) 737-6776

Date: 19 Jan 2001

JMB/cmg

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITH SUFFICIENT POSTAGE AS FIRST CLASS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

ON 19 Jan 2001 (DATE OF DEPOSIT) BY John Belz

SIGNATURE 19 Jan 2001 DATE